DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 062 321 TE 002 871

AUTHOR	Eble, Kenneth E.
TITLE	Preparing College Teachers of English.
INSTITUTION	National Council of Teachers of English, Urbana, Ill. ERIC Clearinghouse on the Teaching of English.
PUB DATE	Mar 72
NOTE	26p.; NCTE/ERIC Studies in the Teaching of English
AVAILABLE FROM	National Council of Teachers of English, 1111 Kenyon Road, Urbana, Illinois 61801 (Stock No. 20319: $0.75 prepaid)
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS	*Attitudes; College Faculty; *College Instruction; Curriculum Design; Educational Innovation; *English Instruction; Evaluation Techniques; Instructional Materials; *Questionnaires; Research; Standards; Surveys; *Teacher Education; Teaching Techniques; Textbooks

ABSTRACT

The first in a series of state-of-the art papers in the area of the teaching of English is presented. Reviews are made of relevant research, curriculum trends, teaching materials, the judgments of recognized experts in the field, reports and findings from various national committees and commission. The point is made that the teacher's image has never been as dominant in higher education as has the image of the scholar. A questionnaire sent to 60 departments of English was designed to bring out: (1) How large a part, in terms of courses, hours, and faculty involved, the English department has in the specific training of teachers; (2) What courses and what faculty were identified specifically as being a part of the English teacher preparation program; (3) What content and what practices were to be found in the "methods" courses taught within the English department; and (4) What texts, evaluation techniques, innovations were used in courses in teacher preparation. Results include: (1) English departments are not very greatly involved in the preparation of teachers outside of the subject matter classes which comprise the program for English majors; and (2) Over half of the schools surveyed did not require additional courses for English teaching majors. Other surveys and their results are also presented. (Author/CK)

ED 062321

75¢

PREPARING COLLEGE TEACHERS OF ENGLISH

Kenneth E. Eble

TE 002 871

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

NCTE ERIC

A CLEARINGHOUSE ON THE TEACHING OF ENGLISH
1111 KENYON ROAD, URBANA, ILLINOIS 61801

Aries, the first sign of the zodiac, is
joined by Taurus and Gemini to form the intellectual
trinity. Those born under its auspices are said
to make innovative and independent teachers and
supervisors. The symbol itself represents a
double spiral, both drawing benefit from the
wisdom of the past and projecting into the future.

NCTE/ERIC Studies in the Teaching of English

FOREWORD TO THE SERIES

The National Center for Educational Research and Development (NCERD—formerly the Bureau of Research) of the United States Office of Education has in recent years considerably expanded its support to basic and applied research in education. It has also made possible and encouraged the dissemination of findings and conclusions. As the body of information derived from research has expanded, however, so has the gap between research and classroom teaching. Recognizing this problem, NCERD has charged ERIC (Educational Resources Information Center) to go beyond its initial function of gathering, evaluating, indexing, and disseminating information to a significant new service: information analysis and synthesis.

The ERIC system has already made available—through the ERIC Document Reproduction Service—much informative data, including all federally funded research reports since 1956. However, if the findings of specific educational research are to be intelligible to teachers and applicable to teaching, considerable bodies of data must be reevaluated, focused, translated, and molded into an essentially different context. Rather than resting at the point of making research reports readily accessible, NCERD has now directed the separate ERIC Clearinghouses to commission from recognized authorities state-of-the-art papers in specific areas.

Each state-of-the-art paper focuses on a concrete educational need. The paper attempts a comprehensive treatment and qualitative assessment of the published and unpublished material on the topic. The author reviews relevant research, curriculum trends, teaching materials, the judgments of recognized experts in the field, reports and findings from various national committees and commissions. In his analysis he tries to answer the question "Where are we?"; sometimes finds order in apparently disparate approaches; often points in new directions. The knowledge contained in a state-of-the-art paper is a necessary foundation for reviewing existing curricula and planning new beginnings.

BERNARD O'DONNELL
Director, NCTE/ERIC

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS COPYRIGHTED MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY NATIONAL COUNCIL OF TEACHERS OF ENGLISH TO ERIC AND ORGANIZATIONS OPERATING UNDER AGREEMENTS WITH THE U.S. OFFICE OF EDUCATION. FURTHER REPRODUCTION OUTSIDE THE ERIC SYSTEM REQUIRES PERMISSION OF THE COPYRIGHT OWNER."

NCTE Stock Number: 20319

Published March, 1972

NCTE/ERIC

This monograph originally appeared in *College English*, Jan. 1972, and was prepared pursuant to a contract with the Office of Education, U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Contractors undertaking such projects under Government sponsorship are encouraged to express freely their judgment in professional and technical matters. Points of view or opinions do not, therefore, necessarily represent official Office of Education position or policy.

KENNETH E. EBLE

Preparing College Teachers of English

I. Attitude Toward Teaching

UNDERGRADUATE TEACHING, for all that it is the principal activity of the majority of college and university professors, does not loom very large within the departmental structures in which teaching goes on. For the past two decades, university departments have built faculties, reputations, and to some extent achievements on the development of graduate work, the research grants attracted, the M.A.s and Ph.D.s produced. Even the undergraduate college measures its excellence by the quality of its preparation of majors for graduate work or the professional schools. This emphasis accounts in part for the neglect of teaching, but other forces are also at work. The teacher's image has never been as dominant in higher education as the image of the scholar—the one who teaches as against the one who knows. The world at large gives its respect in a descending order of importance from the one who does to the one who knows to the one who teaches.

Within university departments, the professor occupies an uneasy position between being teacher and scholar, between knowing and professing that knowledge. (In the vast application of knowledge in an age of technology, some professors are pressed into being doers as well.) But since there is need for a great number of college professors, the teacher is not so much relegated to an inferior position as he is exhorted to be both teacher and scholar, without being asked to show much real regard for the particulars of teaching. The professor's skill as teacher is pretty much left to develop by itself, much as classes get taught whether the person teaching them has any particular skill or not.

These negative observations about college and university teaching arise most immediately out of the work I have been doing as director of the Project to Improve College Teaching. At this stage—reflecting back upon my visits to classes—my impressions of the profession's con-

Kenneth Eble has returned to teaching at the University of Utah after spending two years as Director of the Project to Improve College Teaching.

cern for teaching can be summarized as follows:

> On any given campus the number of individuals who take specific interest in, continuing concern for, teaching is fairly small.
>
> Despite general good will toward superior teaching, the majority of college and university teachers rely almost exclusively on routines performed in traditional ways.
>
> There is a marked distrust of the "popular" teacher, considerable tolerance for various varieties of poor teaching, and a prevailing self-image among almost all professors that his or her teaching is above average.
>
> Despite the fact that a majority of graduate students in the humanities, fewer but large numbers in the sciences, become college teachers, specific preparation for teaching is not a part of most graduate programs.

Teaching as a high art must work against such notions as the belief that the inherent worth of subject matter makes it unnecessary to work at the teaching of it; that the purity of the truth scholars pursue, the objectivity of the scholarly method, rules against a personal involvement in teaching; that pedagogical concerns are to be left to education departments; that truly gifted teachers are born, not made; and that satisfactory teaching can be done by almost anyone who knows enough about his subject.

On the basis of talks with students and faculty in eighty colleges these past two years, I think the students' concern for teaching is greater than the faculty's. The students' severest criticism of their professors is aimed at those who don't appear to care either about their courses or their students. When I have asked groups of upper classmen about how many truly outstanding teachers they have encountered during their college years, the answer is rarely more than three. When I talk to students about teachers and teaching, their remarks usually begin with the strongly negative impressions made by particular teachers and courses. When I talk about the difference between knowing a subject and teaching it, students acknowledge the importance of knowing a subject well but feel that getting it across is of equal importance.

These generalizations apply to English as to other departments. Insofar as English is a central humanistic discipline which deals with communication, one might expect English to express a more than average concern for teaching. Further, since in many universities, large numbers of apprentice teachers staff a consequential part of the English program, English departments might be expected to be rather heavily involved in pedagogy. In the presence of in-service training programs for assistants, and in the attention given to preparing teachers for the public schools, English may be said to be manifesting this concern. And yet, as I have examined English departments, their interest and involvement in teaching is qualified by some adverse reactions to teaching as entrenched in English departments as in other disciplines.

Foremost is the intellectual, scholarly bearing of the English department. The weight of tradition is heavy in English departments both with respect to subject matter and with respect to scholarship. Literature deals with the great figures of literary genius, criticism with rare and refined perceptions, language, until recently, with the cultivation of correctness and propriety. Formal scholarship in English is as firmly grounded and as avidly pursued as in the sciences. English as a discipline upholds *tradition*,

excellence, and *high standards of scholarship*. English departments reflect these beliefs in being conservative, aristocratic, and aloof.

To a considerable degree, these attitudes account for the way in which English departments have separated their scholarly concerns from an interest in teaching. There is, it is fair to observe, a cruder force at work. The flourishing of scholarship in English is related to the size of English departments and this size is largely because of the basic requirements in English at both the public school and college level. But the kind of teaching which reaches the great mass of students—basic instruction in reading and writing—does not have great appeal to the scholarly mind. Thus, any natural inclination to scholarship is strengthened by a desire to avoid the most wearisome aspect of the English professor's tasks.

In all the English departments I have observed, there is a marked separation between the faculty and programs basically concerned with scholarship and those concerned with pedagogy. Prestige and investment of regular faculty energies go with the scholarly activities. Both the teacher preparation programs for the public schools and in-service training of graduate assistants are given over to some few individuals whose success is often measured by the degree to which they spare the rest of the faculty from becoming involved. Jeremiah Finch describes this separation as he perceived it in visiting many college English departments for the Conant study:

> What was predictable was a certain degree of aloofness ranging from mild disapprobation to violent hostility toward those who were professionally involved with public schools and preparing teachers for them. I may say parenthetically that the less hallowed the ivied walls, the sharper the tones of censure. The "gap" was everywhere. I am in no position to weigh the degree of sin on both sides, or to pronounce a verdict on the ancient quarrel between academicians and educators, but I can say, with all the force I have at my command, that the attitude of indifference toward the schools, on the part of many college and university English departments generally, constitutes a massive impediment to the improvement in the study and teaching of English in the United States.[1]

A questionnaire sent out by Minna Work at the University of Utah reveals some details of this separation.[2] The questionnaire went out to 60 departments of English, 51 of which responded. The questionnaire consisted of 18 questions designed to bring out: (1) how large a part, in terms of courses, hours, and faculty involved, the English department has in the specific training of teachers; (2) what courses and what faculty were identified specifically as being a part of the English teacher preparation program; (3) what content and what practices were to be found in the "methods" courses taught within the Engish department; (4) what texts, evaluation techniques, innovations were used in courses in teacher preparation.

The results of this sampling and questionnaire can be summarized as follows. First, English departments are not very greatly involved in the preparation of teachers outside of the subject matter classes which comprise the program for English majors as well as for English *teaching* majors in most colleges and

[1] Jeremiah Finch, "College English Departments and Teacher Preparation," *PMLA*, May, 1965, p. 5.

[2] Minna Work, "A Survey of English Department Programs for the Training of Teachers," University of Utah, 1967, (multilith).

universities. Over half—fifty-six percent of the schools—did not require additional courses or different courses for teaching majors. Fourteen departments, twenty-nine percent of the sample, had no methods classes within the English department, apparently leaving such preparation to the College of Education or not requiring any specific English methods class. Three departments, six percent of the sample, required as many as three courses in the various aspects of teaching language, literature, and composition. Where specific teacher training work existed within the English department, the single English methods courses was the most common practice.

Second, when one looked closely at the responses, it became reasonably apparent that a separation existed within the English department between the teacher training faculty and courses and the rest of the department's faculty and courses. Teachers of methods courses, as compared with the rest of the English department faculty, were much more likely to be women, much less likely to have the Ph.D. degree. Most of the departments indicated that there was a director or a head of the teacher training program (although often this was the *one* person in the program); sixty percent of these directors were male, forty percent, female; fifty-five percent had Ph.D.s, forty-five percent did not. Although the ratio of men to women is probably slightly higher in English departments, it is still close to the overall figure for the university faculty: approximately eighty percent men to twenty percent women.

These observations about the nature of faculty involvement in teacher training programs also apply to the supervision of in-service training for graduate assistants: little involvement of the whole department, but rather the assignment of one or two regular faculty members, usually women, and often without Ph.D. degrees, to take care of the program. My point is simply that an attention to teaching which might be expected of English departments does not exist as a major interest of a majority of the department faculty or of its most well established members.

Additional insight into how English department attitudes toward teaching compare with general college or university attitudes is afforded by the Project's work in evaluation. The committee which brought the Project's booklet, *The Recognition and Evaluation of Teaching*,[3] into being was composed of students, faculty, and administrators from twenty different departments, and the Project's discussions of evaluation at individual schools have usually involved campus-wide audiences. Thus, it was possible to compare my experiences with many departments with those of Richard Larson, University of Hawaii, who was at the same time conducting a survey of evaluation of teaching in English largely through correspondence with department chairmen.[4]

English department faculty members share with other faculty members a common distrust of the fairness, reliability, and effect of various means of evaluating teaching. As in other departments, individual faculty members in English differ widely in their receptivity or hostility to the idea of having their teaching evaluated by students. Classroom visita-

[3] Kenneth E. Eble, *The Recognition and Evaluation of Teaching*, Project to Improve College Teaching, 1970.

[4] Richard Larson, *The Evaluation of Teaching in English*, MLA/ERIC, 1971.

tion, except of graduate assistants, is not commonly practiced. Like faculty members in other departments, with the possible exception of Education and Psychology, English department faculty have little professional interest in or knowledge of evaluation techniques.

Nevertheless, it is possible to generalize that English departments are markedly hostile to quantitative measures which might be used to assess teaching. English departments also appear to be foremost in resisting the systematic efforts characteristic of an organized evaluation procedure. Professor Larson's monograph describes the attitude of many English department chairmen as follows: "The adoption of a systematic process for gathering data, let alone for interpreting it, implies a regularization, a formalization, of an act which by its very nature does not admit of generalized description, a humane act that ought under no circumstances to be degraded by mechanical probes or investigations." It can be observed that English department faculty members are more verbal, though perhaps no more convincing, than their colleagues in other departments.

Since the personal dimensions of teaching are highly valued by English department faculty members, it is not surprising to find an emphasis upon "good manners" in rendering judgments about teaching colleagues. Professor Larson mentions "the paralyzing fear of being rude to colleagues," as an important consideration among department chairmen. His summary discussion of the chairmen's responses points to the reluctance of both chairmen and colleagues to risk being thought rude or gauche by inquiring into a professor's teaching practices.

In sum, it is probably fair to say that English departments incline toward the informal and discreet assessment of a faculty member's performance. Insofar as such an inclination works against the examination of the teaching process, it may be put among those forces, somewhat exaggerated within English departments, which tend to shift attention away from teaching and to discredit those who give it attention.

In concluding this speculative examination of attitudes toward teaching that might be particularly identified with English departments, it is well to observe that individual members of English departments often manifest a keen interest in teaching. One should not expect otherwise, since English departments are large and produce a high percentage of teachers, and because a verbal discipline concerned with communication might be expected to extend that professional concern to teaching. For these reasons, too, some of the best teachers on a given campus are often found in the English department. These last observations make it the more surprising that graduate programs in English pay scarcely more attention to the development of teachers than do graduate programs in the sciences. Perhaps an explanation is to be found in the fondness English faculty members have for perceiving teaching as an art and in their unwillingness to deal with it as a practical necessity.

II. A Survey of Practices

Though English is ahead of some disciplines in the specific pedagogical training and supervision it gives to graduate assistants, its efforts might be characterized as largely defensive in nature. The need is to insure some uniformity of practices among inexperienced teachers

and to reduce the possible cries of outrage from students and parents and administrators. Faced with the necessity of handling many sections of beginning courses, English departments trace an uneasy course between exploitation and apprentice training. Some forms of systematic supervision are to be found in almost all English departments which employ large numbers of assistants. In departments which do not maintain large numbers of assistants, even less attention is given to specific preparation for undergraduate teaching though a number of these departments strongly encourage or require teaching experience.

English is not alone in neglecting graduate students as teachers. In few academic departments, however, is teaching so much the only occupational end. In biology, for example, 69 percent of students getting Ph.D.s from 94 universities from 1963-67 went into teaching. In the sciences, generally, the percentage is less, just as in the humanities, the percentage approaches or surpasses that of English. It is useful to draw upon the work of CUEBS,[5] the Commission on Undergraduate Education in the Biological Sciences, to reflect upon the general university situation.

A survey of the 94 leading universities granting Ph.D. degrees in biology revealed that 66 percent provided no special training to teaching assistants before they taught, and eighty percent offered no special course or seminar in any aspect of college teaching. To judge from the work of CUEBS, only a small but active part of the profession is clearly concerned with the implications of such training. Young college biology teachers, however, are acutely concerned. At a conference in Washington, D. C., in 1969, fourteen recent Ph.D. graduates who had taught for one year, nine graduate students now in Ph.D. programs at major universities, and fourteen department heads, faculty members, and foundation officials confronted the problem. There was unanimous agreement about the high quality of academic preparation in the graduate schools, and almost unanimous agreement about the deficiencies in preparation of teachers.

The reasons given apply to all disciplines: *teaching has a lower status than research; subject matter training is all that is thought necessary as training for teaching; the schedule is too crowded, the faculty too busy to give attention to teaching; "education" is a pejorative term in academia;* and *strong conflicts exist as to whether teachers can be taught or how they might be.* Nevertheless, at the Washington conference and at subsequent regional meetings, there was strong agreement that preparation for college teaching must become part of the graduate program. Specific recommendations to the graduate schools include: 1. consideration of a D.A. or other practitioner's degree; 2. permit creative investigation related to the teaching of biology to be used as a dissertation; 3. improve the program for teaching assistants; 4. consider developing a seminar or course on effective teaching as a companion to the teaching experience; 5. find ways to enlist the participation of senior members of the department in the improvement of the program for future teachers.

All of these are equally applicable to the English department. Insofar as research in itself is less an occupational end

[5]Donald Dean, *Preservice Preparation of College Biology Teachers: A Search for a Better Way*, CUEBS, 1970.

for English Ph.D. graduates, they apply with greater force. Similarly, the general recommendations to improve the dignity and status of teaching, to include the teaching performance of faculty members as a criterion for advancement, and to make teaching competitive with research in the rewards each brings, apply to English as to other disciplines.

It must be acknowledged that during the past decade English has given an increasing attention to the development of teachers. The Dartmouth conference, the formation of the Association of Departments of English, Project English and the NDEA fellowships and institutes, the emergence of the Conference on English Education within the National Council of Teachers of English can be cited as evidence. But English departments have always had a large responsibility for training teachers for the public schools and most of the renewed emphasis upon teaching has been in this direction. While the gains in the English department's involvement in improving the training of public school teachers are considerable, no such gains are yet evident in preparing teachers for college and universities. Practical necessity has shifted attention to the preparation of junior college teachers of English. The MLA study of English in the junior colleges[6] will doubtless increase the efforts of some graduate English departments to provide specific preparation for junior college teaching. In many ways, the increasing attention being given to training public school and junior college teachers of English will have beneficial effects upon the programs for preparation of college teachers. As yet, however, one cannot point to many graduate departments of English which seriously undertake to prepare college teachers other than to give them strongly research-oriented subject matter preparation within the traditional boundaries defining the formal study of English and American literature.

In order to get some data on the existence of specific training for college teachers, the NCTE-ERIC Clearinghouse sent out a questionnaire to thirty-three English departments designed to include a representative sampling of different kinds of graduate schools and in total to embrace institutions granting seventy percent of recent Ph.D.s in English. Twenty-seven usable replies were received.

The schools in the survey were the Universities of Florida, Chicago, Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Michigan, Minnesota, Nebraska, Missouri, North Carolina, Pennsylvania, Texas, Utah, Washington, Wisconsin, California at Berkeley and Los Angeles, Denver University and Florida State; Yale, Harvard, Vanderbilt, Ohio State, Duke, NYU, Fordham, Cornell, Columbia, Princeton, and Northwestern. In addition, the non-Ph.D. granting institutions—Oklahoma State, Virginia Polytechnic, and Eastern Washington State—were included to find out what kind of new M.A., M.Ed. or Ed.D. programs might be in evidence.

Among these schools are those of gigantic size: The University of Minnesota with 43,000 students, Ohio State with 50,000, and Washington with 33,000. The middle range in size included schools like the University of Iowa, North Carolina, or Utah with total enrollments of around 20,000 students, but with the number of Ph.D.s in English

[6]Richard Worthen, Michael Shugrue, *The National Study of English in the Junior College*, MLA/ERIC, 1970.

ranging from twelve in the 1957-66 period at Utah to eighty-six at North Carolina. A number of graduate departments are comparatively small in total number of graduate students but large in the number of Ph.D.s awarded. Chicago with ninety-seven Ph.D.s in the ten-year period and Northwestern with eighty-three are examples of these departments. Other very highly respected departments keep graduate enrollments in English within a limit of 100 to 200 students. But for the most part graduate work in English, as in other disciplines, goes on chiefly in the contexts of departments and institutions of large size. Some of the very large departments have responsibilities for 40,708 individual enrollments (Ohio State), 3,594 majors (University of Washington), and 300 to 400 English graduate students (at many of the very large institutions). Though the declining market may reduce graduate enrollments in English in many departments, graduate work will still be taking place in contexts of such size as to make change extremely difficult.

The sample chosen represents the long-established prestige schools, the great (in size certainly) state universities with impressive graduate programs, and the lesser state and private schools which turn out a comparatively small number of degrees. As might be expected, the prestige schools as a group show least evidence of specific efforts being made to prepare teachers. However, many of these schools indicate changes are in the wind. The schools which see little or no need for change in the direction of teacher preparation are those which have been long identified with scholarly research of a traditional kind. The apparent receptiveness of the majority of schools, including the prestige institutions, to moving toward greater responsibility for better preparation of college teachers, suggests that a separation between strictly research institutions and multi-purpose graduate English departments is not imminent. Changes in Ph.D. programs are in evidence and they are likely to affect most, if not all, departments granting Ph.D. degrees.

The first set of questions tried to identify "specific program or programs (something more than an additional course or two)" designed for preparing junior college teachers or four-year college teachers. Among the twenty-three major schools, only five identified such programs. Only three reported having D.A. or equivalent programs with a strong emphasis upon teaching. The responses to questions about the details of such programs disclose little substantial course work. The specific courses listed raise some questions about what departments think college English teachers are likely to do. "Bibliography and Methods," "Introduction to Graduate Study," "Teaching of English in Secondary Schools," "Seminar in Literary Problems," "Comparative Grammar," "Rhetorical Theory," "Critical Approaches to Literary Texts," "Problems in College Composition and Grammar," "English as a Second Language," may offer useful training for a limited kind of college teaching, but they are surely not courses that very directly contribute to producing skilled and enlightened undergraduate teachers.

It is often argued that courses are not the way to prepare college teachers. The sparsity of suitable courses, however, was not to any degree explained by the presence of other means for preparing teachers. Options to either the M.A. thesis or

Ph.D. dissertation which would permit "formal research in the teaching of English," "development of a course, experimentation in methodology, or other investigations of teaching of English" were permitted in only four of the Ph.D.-granting departments. Only in respect to requiring teaching experience did a large number of institutions respond positively. Some eight schools said teaching was required of Ph.D. candidates, though only one school (Wisconsin) specifically indicated a minimum: one year and three courses. In twelve schools, however, teaching was regarded as an important part of training for many Ph.D. candidates.

The picture which emerges very clearly is that subject matter course work and formal research embodied in a dissertation still constitute the preparation of college teachers in the major graduate schools. Where course work is being offered, it often appears to be an outgrowth of specific needs of teachers of freshman composition, and aimed more at the assistant teaching in the institution in which he is taking graduate work than at the prospective faculty member elsewhere.

The picture alters only slightly if we look at the four institutions offering variants of M.A. and Ed.D. degrees. Here a substantial number of courses and hours are indicated in (1) "credit course or courses in general aspects of teaching and learning" and (2) "credit course or courses in specific aspects of teaching English." Most of these courses disclose the present or past status of these schools as teacher training institutions. As might be expected, their responsiveness to the needs of the community or junior colleges appears to be greater than that of major departments. But there does not appear to be a much further departure from conventional training programs for public school English teachers in these departments than the departure of major departments from subject matter-research preparation of college teachers.

Since more than half the schools indicated that many Ph.D. candidates had teaching experience as a major part of their training, and eight indicated that teaching experience was required of Ph.D. candidates, the kind and extent of teaching and the nature of supervision were vital aspects of specific teacher preparation. The questionnaire attempted to find out something about the supervision of teaching done by graduate students and the role of the graduate students within the department. The responses to this part of the questionnaire revealed no great surprises. Freshman composition was the only course taught by graduate students in about a third of the departments. Another third indicated that graduate students taught one or two courses other than freshman composition, usually some form of introduction to literature. A final third indicated three or more courses. Most of the courses other than composition and introduction to literature were specialized courses that probably fell to an occasional graduate student.

Supervision of graduate student teaching came almost entirely from a designated faculty member and experienced graduate students. The involvement of regular staff members at all ranks was very small, although at one place or another such practices as the following did exist: full professors supervising beginning teachers, members of all ranks visiting assistant's classes, and members of the regular staff teaching with graduate assistants and frequently participating in

training sessions and discussions. More common among a majority of graduate schools were the following supervisory practices: conference and discussion with designated supervisor, group discussion between supervisor and assistants, in-service training program, student-teacher assigned to experienced teacher, and pre-service training. Group discussions in which many staff members participated on a regular basis, however, were not often reported.

The nature of supervision emerges as clearly as did the absence of courses specifically concerned with teaching. It is one of those responsibilities placed with (one could sometimes say "shoved off on") a designated faculty member. He or she arranges a program which uses various devices of in-service and pre-service training. The departments do not regard such supervision as *pro forma,* but neither is the department faculty heavily involved in the program. Such programs probably do assist in the development of the effective teacher, but they fall far short of an imaginative and concerted department effort.

The graduate student gaining teaching experience is revealed in these responses as a person with a large responsibility for the courses he teaches but with much less voice in general department matters. In almost all departments, such teachers had primary responsibility for final examinations and grading. But in about one-fourth of the schools, they did not have primary responsibility for selection of textbooks, development of the course syllabus, or revising courses or developing new courses. In regard to that part of the departmental curriculum in which they had important teaching responsibilities, graduate students in three-fourths of the departments were reported to have a major role. "But," one respondent reported, "their voice is getting stronger."

Two final questions completed this limited survey. Only four departments of the entire group reported using "any systematic form of feedback from graduates now teaching in junior colleges, colleges, or universities as to the effectiveness of its program as a preparation for a college teaching career." The experience of the CUEBS conference, mentioned earlier, suggests that English departments, like other departments, are passing over a very valuable source of information.

The last question, directed to the chairman or graduate director was simply: "Are you satisfied with the present program?" Six respondents said "yes," two "yes, but," and seventeen "no."

A great many respondents indicated that programs were undergoing revision, and some suggested the direction such revisions might take or that they would like to see them take. Following are specific comments of this kind:

> "We need to go beyond what we are now doing. The department has appointed a D.A. committee. In a relatively short period of six months, representing intensive study and work, the committee came up with a thorough and imaginative report. It held hearings among the regular faculty and graduate students and plans to have a conference of Junior college faculty. (University of Washington)

> "I should like to have one year's teaching a formal requirement for Ph.D. candidates." (Duke)

> "We must set up a system of guided teaching in introductory literature with a one-to-one relationship between graduate-assistant teacher and senior profesor, visiting one another's course, talking reg-

ularly together, examining the rationale of the specific courses, and so on." (Ohio State)

"Like everyone else, we are uptight about teaching training, D.A. programs, student participation, etc. etc. A committee is studying the whole question of preparation for a college teaching career, and will make its recommendations later in the year." (Fordham)

"The third and newest option available is for graduate students to sit in on a section of one of our basic courses, following the methods of a given teacher and discussing them with him at intervals, and upon occasion taking over the class for one or two meetings with the regular teacher sitting in and evaluating the performance." (Yale)

"We are discussing possible changes." (Columbia)

". . . in the process of revising both its M.A. and Ph.D. programs—in what ways it's too early for me to say." (University of Chicago)

"We are now involved in extensive review of our program." (University of Minnesota)

III. Courses and Programs

Though the questionnaires gathered only limited data, the responses do give some glimpses of existing programs. UCLA, for example, lists nine courses in English which are regarded as specific training courses for college teachers: History of the English Language, English Language Study for Teachers, Afro-American English, Composition for Teachers, Teaching of College English Composition, Current Issues in the Teaching of English, Teaching English to Minority Groups, and The Teaching of English.

The University of Iowa has a similar variety of course offerings: Teaching in Reading Laboratory, Teaching in Writing Laboratory, Teaching Freshman Composition, Colloquium in Teaching, and Literature in College, all offered in the English department, and English Methods, Adolescent Literature, Seminar in English Education, Problems in English, offered cooperatively by the English and Education departments.

There are some obvious comments to be made about these courses. At both institutions, the courses are related to specific needs—the internal ones of graduate assistants who teach beginning courses—and the external ones of better training for public school teachers. Equally obvious are the overlaps in the offerings and the absence of any clear pattern, though some courses might be profitably taken together. In these two graduate schools (and in a number of others) it is clearly possible within the degree framework to get some specific course preparation in teaching aspects of English. As yet, however, there appears to be little, if any, course work about how students learn. English department courses (and very few responses revealed graduate courses in Education) do not concern themselves with learning theory or its application nor do they draw upon the impressive body of research in changes in student attitudes and values which have been going on for over a decade. Many students will, of course, have touched upon these subjects in undergraduate psychology courses, others may have had an education course or two, some will have picked up information on their own. But as one of the respondents said, "We don't know enough about theories of learning and teaching." There are few signs that English departments are willing either to encourage students to go outside the

department to gain such knowledge or to bring into the department such knowledge from outside.

An example from Harvard bears upon this problem. The Bureau of Study Council at Harvard has what seems to be a remarkable program for assisting beginning teachers in developing skill. The formal program grew out of attempts to assist Harvard students having trouble with their studies (and Harvard students, like other students, do have such problems). From these conversations with students, which often dwelt upon teachers and teaching, an informal program began in assisting graduate fellows to develop as teachers. The program relies on extensive use of audio tapes of teachers at Harvard and elsewhere and accompanying small group discussion not only of specific techniques of teaching but of principles which underlie such techniques, the relationships being created, the attitudes apparent in student-teacher interaction which may or may not foster learning. The program is low-key but impressive in its general results (William Perry's book *Forms of Intellectual and Ethical Development in the College Years* describes the work as it relates to student development). Yet, though the service is available to Harvard's departments, few take advantage of it, and no department has moved to incorporate its most important features into a graduate program. Harvard, it should be said, was the second leading producer of English Ph.D.s in the 1951-66 period, with 280 (Columbia led with 427).

A traditional suspicion of "education" stands in the way of developing programs for teachers which would integrate work in learning theory and student development with other aspects of English graduate study. Don Cameron Allen's *The Ph.D. in English and American Literature* questions whether "there should be courses for graduate students at all." He goes on to describe the hodgepodge of courses that can constitute subject matter preparation.

> In the scurry to attain graduate teaching status, to belong to what is curiously regarded as the university's elite corps, too many specialized and unrelated courses are recorded in most graduate catalogues. When Professor U has a course in Victorian Poetry, Professor V a course in Victorian Prose, Professor W a course in Tennyson, Professor X a course in Dickens and Thackeray, Professor Y a course in Arnold, Professor Z's course in the Corn Law Rimers is a little too much. This illustration is not invented but drawn from life; nonetheless, one can grant that some courses are essential.

I find something of this in both the UCLA and Iowa programs: a variety of courses are in existence but without a clear sense of relationship either among themselves or to the career of a college teacher.

My own investigations of the past year lead me to believe that a formal course would be neither ill-advised nor wasteful if it were to convey some of the information we now possess about how students learn and the contexts in which learning is most likely to take place. I am less confident that formal course work in specifics, the teaching of composition, for example, will have any more actual relation to a student's development into a superior college teacher than exposure to Anglo-Saxon has to his development as a superior scholar.

The Allen report's recommendations 38 and 39 are worth quoting in full:

(38) The Ph.D. in English and Ameri-

can Literature is assumed to possess a broad knowledge of his subject and the ability to explore and interpret it in a humanistic manner. Too often the emphasis is on exploring it and interpreting it in a way sufficient to himself and to like-minded specialists when, if we may say it again, his honest professional duty is to the undergraduate student. We must consequently see to it that our doctoral students are better than mediocre teachers, and we should make more than ordinary effort to train them as teachers and measure their teaching skill.

(39) Too great a percentage of our recent Ph.D.s have had no teaching experience when they assumed their first posts. This may be an unfortunate situation and we should give more thought to it. Many young Ph.D.s are, of course, inherently gifted as teachers and have enough passive experience with teaching to do well enough on their initial day in the classroom but no matter what the gifts and the experiences are, active effort always brings improvement. Anyone can profit from some sort of teacher education before he enters the profession fully armed with learning; and by teacher education we do not mean the thin and redundant instruction provided by colleges of education. We have something more simple and probably more effective in mind. Each graduate student should have classroom experience, directed and criticized by a senior teacher of merit.

The recommendation that each graduate student be required to do practice teaching is not a commendation of the long drawn-out teaching assistantship already denounced; it springs from the realization that it is unfair to society to send out pedagogically ignorant Ph.D.s whose teaching powers are unknown and cannot be described. Hence, a part of the regular doctoral course should be required supervised teaching for one or two years. The student should teach no more than two or three hours a week, but he should meet with his fellow apprentices in a seminar under the direction of a senior professor to discuss and plan each week's program. He should be visited in his classroom by the same professor, who can then inform his colleagues about the student's talents in the profession's principal art. Each student should be given the same credit for this work as he received for his other required courses like "Philology"; in fact, this course, so often the cause of complaint, might be better justified were it considered as a preparation for the teaching of Freshman Composition, a subject that will engage the energies of many young Ph.D.s for quite a while.

The University of Pennsylvania apparently places its emphasis upon this last paragraph of the recommendation. While its response to other parts of the questionnaire were negative—no courses, no special programs, no dissertation options—it was one of eight places which required teaching experience of all advanced degree candidates. Further, such experience was accompanied by all the varieties of supervision listed on the questionnaire. Graduate students who did teach, though apparently restricted to freshman English courses, did have "primary responsibility" for selection of texts, development of the course syllabus, final examinations, grades, and revising the course or developing new courses. Finally, there appeared to be an uncommonly high involvement of all regular faculty members in the supervisory program. Visiting classes, teaching with an inexperienced or less experienced graduate student, and participating in training sessions were noted of all ranks, though with the common decline in involvement in the upper ranks.

Such attention to mandatory teaching experience and careful supervision of it probably accounts for the positive answer to the last question, "Are you satisfied with the present program?"

Although Yale's program does not require teaching experience, it does attempt

to introduce students to teaching in a personally supervised way. I quote from a letter accompanying the questionnaire:

> We offer no courses in teaching, and we do not on principle require teaching experience of our graduate students, although we strongly urge it. There are three avenues to teaching experience available. The first is teaching part-time in the course of the final year or two of graduate work, and this is limited to a very few students. We prefer wherever possible to have full-time faculty teaching our freshmen. The second is teaching discussion sections of our upper-class lecture courses. These are courses in the major, and they are taught by senior members of the department for the most part. Graduate students take one meeting a week or, in some cases, every other week. What they do in that meeting is the result of discussion with each other and with the senior member in charge of the course. They attend the lectures in the course and also grade the papers. The third and newest option available is for graduate students to sit in on a section of one of our basic courses, following the methods of a given teacher and discussing them with him at intervals, and upon occasion taking over the class for one or two meetings with the regular teacher sitting in and evaluating the performance.

Aside from these particulars which reveal both attitudes and practices within major departments, the questionnaires afforded only scattered information useful to developing an imaginative program. The best insight into one specific but common kind of training experience is given in Richard Braddock's description of the current program at the University of Iowa. His account[7] is worth careful attention by any department seriously interested in making the most of apprentice teaching.

Professor Braddock describes the old program, in effect with only slight revision from 1945 to 1968. It is what I have characterized as a "defensive program" common throughout English departments. Its structure was the weekly meeting usually devoted to the nitty-gritty problems of grading, marking papers, handling assignments. It was not a conspicuous success, and in 1968 was strengthened by requiring all new assistants to take a one-semester lecture-seminar course, "Teaching Freshman Rhetoric." Two hours' credit was granted for the course. But, as commonly happens to the lecture-discussion arrangement, the lectures often vaporized and subsequent discussion seemed to lack point and organization.

In the fall of 1970, a further revision took place. The course became almost entirely a seminar; ten graduate assistants met with one regular faculty member and one experienced assistant, all of whom were currently teaching the course. The co-leaders were carefully paired to capitalize on diverse approaches to teaching. The course had a tentative schedule, but considerable staff time went into building the following week's meeting on the results of the previous one. The seminar is working better than it ever has before, and Braddock's advice is: "Heavily involve your colleagues—both experienced and inexperienced colleagues—in any program you have for helping your new instructors meet the problem of their first teaching."

It is also noteworthy to me that Professor Braddock acknowledges that the new program came out of listening to the complaints and suggestions of beginning and experienced instructors. The ques-

[7] Richard Braddock, "Reversing the Peter Principle to Help Inexperienced Graduate Assistants Teach Freshman Rhetoric," *College English*, October 1970, 45-49.

tion on our questionnaire which drew a complete blank was one which inquired into the existence of feedback from graduates now teaching as to the effectiveness of their preparation for college teaching careers. Such feedback is hard to obtain. Despite the orientation of students to their disciplines and departments, once they leave the university, they become the property of the alumni office, which in itself has little contact with the departments. The difficulty of obtaining feedback, however, should not stand in the way of trying to obtain it. Nor should it prevent a department from making use of feedback nearer at hand: from graduate student-teachers while they are still within the department.

If workable programs are to come into existence, some such process as followed in the CUEBS conferences is probably necessary. A series of meetings among recent graduates, graduate students, and regular staff members seems essential to planning. Over a period of time, a sense of what a department's graduates actually do as teachers might get across to the regular staff. Graduate students, inured to bearing an underground burden of complaint, would have a context in which such complaints might gain a meaningful hearing. Even the most common of faculty practices, that of letting everything run along in its accustomed ways, might be disturbed sufficiently to make other ways seem attractive. It is clear that departmental discussions are going on. My hope is that they will be illuminated by the actualities of teaching being faced by recent graduates and by the shared wisdom of the department's publishing scholars, dedicated teachers, senior and junior staff members, chairman and director of graduate studies, supervisors of graduate assistants, graduate students, and graduates teaching elsewhere. Through such activity, coherent, consequential, and effective means of preparing college teachers may emerge.

IV. Proposals and Conclusions

What has been noted thus far are individual courses, ways of supervising teaching experience, options for the dissertation which do give specific attention to preparing college teachers. What are lacking are strong overall programs. The efforts being made both in English and in other disciplines do, however, disclose practices and experiences useful to shaping such programs. First, actual teaching experience and involvement of the regular staff with such experience seem to be central. The experience in training students for the public schools also points in this direction. The general disrespect accorded classes in "education" is in large part attributable to the difference between the vital act of teaching and the theoretical discussion of it. Changes in preparation programs for public school teachers have moved to earlier and more extensive involvement of students in actual teaching experience. And surely a great need in Education departments as in subject matter departments is to get professors out of college classrooms into public school classrooms to find out what teaching and students and schools are like *now*. Given a chance to create a program which would best train graduate students as teachers, a department would probably be wise not to start with courses, but with patterns of experiences most beneficial to the developing teacher, which might be supported by discussion and course work.

What might this involve? Let me list a number of practical necessities:

1. *Required teaching experience.*

For the Ph.D., a year's experience would seem to be a minimum. Two year's experience involving at least two different courses would be better. Most graduate assistants already have the latter, and a number of the major graduate departments which do not rely heavily upon teaching assistants do seek to give their graduate students some kind of actual teaching experience.

2. *Limiting the number of courses taught.*

Clearly, teaching done by assistants is only in part apprentice training for a future career. In general, graduate assistants teach too much both for the good of the programs they staff and for the good of the graduate student's development as teacher. Until a department is willing and able to break the connection between economic necessity and the employment of graduate students, the training of graduate students as teachers will be less than it should be.

As a general rule, a graduate student should teach no more than one class per term during his first year. Ideally, he should probably teach no more than that at any time when he is pursuing a degree, but the realities seem to argue for acceptance of more teaching beyond the first year. Flexibility is probably more important than precise limitations. It is conceivable that every graduate program might have specific teaching quarters in which courses taught would loom large in the student's program and in which other course work or activities would be closely related to that teaching.

The necessity is to get away from the automatic assumption, particularly to be found in state universities, that the graduate assistant teaches half of regular faculty teaching "load" and devotes the other half of his time to scholarship. It is a crude division, not very supportive of either scholarship or teaching. At the same time, the fear that teaching will interfere with the preparation of the scholar still persists in some graduate schools. Too much teaching certainly interferes. But teaching experience in itself usefully works against the sterility of literary scholarship which has lost connection from the need to make it known, make it mean something. Properly done—and this does not mean merely throwing assistants into freshman English while the regular staff retreats to upper-division courses and graduate work—apprentice teaching can be good for both the apprentice teacher and his students and for the regular faculty members who remain involved in that aspect of instruction.

3. *Strengthening the regular faculty's support of apprentice teaching.*

Some eminent English departments—Yale, most notably—have tried to preserve the health of undergraduate instruction by insisting that all members of the staff teach lower division classes. At many lesser institutions, the regular staff has moved out of freshman classes, out of introductory literature courses, and except for the newest member of the staff, out of everything but specialized courses in the professor's area of competence. I doubt that the trend is reversible, though a willingness to look at the broader implications of both undergraduate and graduate education may be developing within the profession. As regards the supervision of apprentice teachers, a department's willingness to take such supervision seriously could bring more of the regular staff back to the

lower division, if not as teachers then as experienced teachers working with apprentice teachers. The possibilities are numerous and even attractive: Team teaching with a young, turned-on graduate student can be a valuable learning experience for both parties. A skilled senior professor working with apprentice teachers may be as valuable a deployment of resources as his teaching a graduate seminar. Visiting classes can be a means not only of checking on apprentice teachers but of developing interest and effectiveness of both the visitor and the visited.

Departmental work with apprentice teachers need not become the assigned task for certain individuals but be thoroughly infused with the various strengths and styles of the entire staff. The essentials—making up the syllabus, choosing texts, reading themes, grading, testing—need not be the extent or even the center of a good apprentice teacher program. Departments need to make the most of their total strengths and variety of their teachers. Teaching which draws in members of the entire staff opens up possibilities for self-renewal more necessary to the senior staff than to the beginners.

4. *Making teacher preparation part of the graduate program.*

The supervision of graduate assistants as now practiced still maintains a distance between his teaching duties and interests and his specific subject matter preparation. It is often a value distinction, similar to the distinction between the undergraduate English major's work in the college of education and his or her work in the department. As long as these value distinctions are maintained, the preparation of English graduate students as teachers is likely to be half-hearted and half-successful.

Making the preparation of the teacher a genuine part of the student's graduate program is the major step to be taken. If formal or informal course work is to be offered, it should carry credit. Whether we approve of the general practice of counting credits or not, almost everything of apparent value in American higher education carries such credits. Informal and formal work in teaching should not be excluded. It is possible, of course, in graduate programs which have eliminated the mechanical counting of hours, to think of teaching experience, related coursework, and supervision as one important component of degree work which, like the dissertation or the working up of an area of specialization, must be successfully completed to earn the degree. Whatever is done, the work connected with teaching experience needs to be an integral part of the program rather than an outside activity.

The above suggestions are all aimed at establishing a vital relationship between subject matter courses and preparation for teaching. In the ideal graduate program, simply because most of the professors would be superb teachers and would embrace a variety of teaching styles, every subject matter course would be a course in pedagogy. Alas, it is not so. So far are we from the ideal that the testimony of many graduate students suggests that often the development of a graduate student into a superior teacher consists of avoiding the bad practices he has encountered in his graduate professors.

Graduate professors vary widely in their teaching effectiveness and in the degree of attention they give to teaching

itself. Nevertheless it is not too much to ask that some professors in a graduate faculty will consciously and foremost think of their students as future *teachers.* A modest attention to teaching within the courses such professors teach can be a powerful incentive for students to develop as teachers. It also can bring about that continuing examination of what we teach, how we teach, and to what end that is missing in the department's activities as in the graduate students' programs.

To suggest a further range of possibilities, consider what might result if the teacher of early American literature were to see his course in that period not solely as a scholarly probing of a historical period to sharpen (or dull) the graduate students' minds, but as a scholarly probing aimed at illuminating the general public understanding of a portion of the American past. Such an aim would probably not settle for the three-hour survey course tucked into a total program which might include during the same semester Anglo-Saxon, a seminar in literary criticism and two sections of freshman composition. It might argue that the student's course work, teaching, and outside interests all contribute to his understanding of a portion of human experience.

An interest in William Faulkner, for example, reaches out into many aspects of graduate study and undergraduate teaching. The invitation to a freshman group to explore their own "postage stamps of land" could be the center. While they were exploring, on and off campus, in literature and outside, their own towns or neighborhoods, the graduate assistant would be attempting a similar exploration. Course work might or might not be useful. Readings in history, anthropology, political science, linguistics, but more important, in town records, newspapers, diaries, would probably be indispensable. With such a topic, classroom boundaries should give way both in exploring the topic and in letting others know about one's findings. One aim would be to create an imaginative sympathy for a community, not only in its present appearance but in its ties to its populated past and to the land itself. Another would be to arouse and sustain the urge to find ways of expressing that understanding, not necessarily "literary" ways, and as much a responsibility for the graduate assistant teacher as for his undergraduate students. And as a major outcome, such a proposed task should also add to the understanding of those outside the university. Not, it should be said, as objects of study, but as an enlarged circle of acquaintances. Teaching and learning, then, might be going on in a number of different ways, seemingly unconnected with formal graduate study in literature, but in fact tightly connected with a kind of development more important than formal study itself—the broadening and deepening of one's understanding and imagination.

Inter-departmental work has always been a somewhat pious hope but never a very much realized actuality. Perhaps this is because specialized work, done in piecemeal fashion, needs to maintain no sense of ultimate use. Perceiving the immediate if not ultimate end of course work as that of preparing students to fulfill the broad needs of undergraduate teaching might restore this sense of purpose. By such a route, we might get graduate students into related subject matters, might involve them and their professors in working with both public school colleagues and the community

outside. Drama, poetry, language itself, are not just schoolroom concerns. Graduate studies are in an ideal position to put literary and linguistic competence to work in other ways than scholarly investigations remote from any immediate or ultimate wide audience. The public schools can provide access to a wider public; graduate students and professors entering into collaborative efforts with the schools could provide new perspectives in working with a wider public.

The kind of doctoral dissertation and the emphasis placed upon it is another important consideration. The Allen report is not very respectful of the traditional dissertation once considered "ultimate proof of the doctoral student's competence," and maintained as "an original contribution to knowledge." The report not only recommends shortening the thesis and making it more to the point but asks the question: "Does not good sense also suggest that something other than the traditional dissertation is sufficient evidence of a candidate's literary ability?" The passage goes on to endorse theses of a critical nature as well as original work of literary merit, both of which have been accepted by many graduate departments.

The way seems clear to suggest something other than the traditional dissertation as evidence of a candidate's *teaching* ability. It is a curious paradox of the literary scholar's aims and fulfillment that few of the many doctoral students trained in research remain productive scholars, just as few become writers in any professional sense. But almost all do become teachers at least by the visible evidence of what occupies their time. It seems wasteful, therefore, to put off certain kinds of demanding, scholarly, written work until after the student achieves the doctor's degree. The preparation of a good course involving the assembling and imaginative structuring of materials and carrying with it a clear sense of purpose and ideas for achieving that purpose is a task fully as demanding and rewarding as writing a research thesis. The argument that the research dissertation experience is invaluable to the development of a scholar is no more compelling than the argument that the teaching "dissertation" would be invaluable to the development of the teacher.

The University of Utah now offers such a thesis option. The option includes in its specifications the actual teaching of the course under the supervision and evaluation of the candidate's thesis committee. The Doctor of Arts degree at Carnegie-Mellon permits three types of dissertations: curricular, scholarly, or creative. "The first two types of dissertation, growing out of applied curricular or pedagogical investigation or out of traditional literary research, will demonstrate the candidate's ability to do original work on a significant topic. Each will relate literary scholarship to the teaching of literature. That is, the dissertation based primarily on curricular or pedagogical research will be consonant with sound scholarship and criticism of the literature involved, and the dissertation based primarily on historical or critical research will examine the implications of its findings for teaching."

The Doctor of Arts as a teaching degree is currently receiving much support. The cluster of questions asked in the Allen report about the feasibility of an "intermediate degree" reveals the difficulty any such degree faces. Department chairmen responding to suggestions for "improving the training of people who wish to teach but do not plan to do

research" substantially favored a "degree emphasizing teaching and not research" and "an intermediate degree between the M.A. and the Ph.D." On the other hand, almost three-fourths of recent recipients of Ph.D. degrees said they would not have taken an intermediate degree even if it would have brought them the same post and prospects they now have. A slightly smaller percentage of recent recipients said that a four-year doctorate should have a teaching internship.

I make mention of the Doctor of Arts degree here because plans I have seen for D.A. degrees in English differ from the Ph.D. chiefly in substituting some kind of curriculum or pedagogical study or activity for the dissertation. In some proposals this is tied in with the teaching internship, in other proposals it is not. As yet, proposals for D.A. degrees in English are too few and too tied to existing practices and requirements for the Ph.D. to point the way to imaginative graduate programs for prospective teachers. Nevertheless, the D.A. degree may establish itself in American higher education, and there seems to be common agreement that it will be a college "teaching" degree. At the present time, the D.A. degree in English is offered only at Carnegie-Mellon and the University of Oregon. Somewhat equivalent programs under some form of master's or doctor's degree exist at probably a dozen or so institutions. Sixty-eight institutions are launching, developing, or considering the possibility of developing Doctor of Arts degree programs.[8] Ten of these have been given substantial financial support by the Carnegie Commission.

One last aspect of the conventional graduate program needs discussion: The examination or examinations which are the crucial tests for a Ph.D. candidate. The Allen report is informative in this respect. Despite the general fears created by the major examination, particularly if it is oral, recent recipients of the degree were in much agreement about its value. The most convincing reason for this endorsement was that the preparation for the examination had given them a command over a large body of material in a way that had not been accomplished in course work. If we add to this observation, the suggestion of department chairmen that the preliminary examination could be improved by reducing the number of fields, the scope, and length, we have a basis for considering the examination in relation to preparing college teachers.

It seems necessary to me to provide within the examination some recognition of a candidate's specific preparation for teaching. Perhaps the easiest way is that of asking the candidate to work up as a part of his examination a short oral presentation of some aspect of his studies. If he is cautioned against making this an exercise to impress the examiners with his erudition, such a presentation can give the examiners a sense of his ability to organize material, develop relationships and ideas, and get this across to a general as well as specialized audience. A good many examinations proceed in just this way. Its advantages are great for reducing the initial paralysis that can grip the candidate. More might be made of its usefulness in stressing the future responsibilities of the college teacher.

Departments are likely to favor some such procedure as above, for the general

[8] Robert Koenker, "Status of the Doctor of Arts and Sixth-Year Degree and Non-Degree Programs for Preparing Junior College and College Teachers," Ball State University, 1970 (mimeo).

tendency to reduce the size and scope of the examination conflicts with the number of areas which individual department members regard as indispensable. If we add "teaching" to a list which is already too long (one-third of the departments responding to the Allen questionnaire indicated nine fields were required for the preliminary exam), we complicate the problem of making the examination somewhat reasonable. For that reason, I think it is more important that the teaching preparation be given indirect recognition within the scope of a reduced preliminary examination or be more appropriately tested in the course of a candidate's pursuing a degree.

Appropriate examination should include actual observation by staff members with particular skill and interest in teaching, feedback from students, and counseling over a period of the candidate's development as a teacher. Such ongoing "testing" is more important than a climactic examination which is to reveal at one sitting the competence or incompetence of a teacher. If a dissertation option of the kind just discussed is chosen by the candidate, such examination would be taken care of there. If not, however, and in consideration of the weight placed upon the "prelims," some effort should be made to keep the ongoing examination of teaching from becoming mere routine. Various means might be sought to formalize the process sufficiently so that the candidate would profit from consciously preparing for teaching as he profits from consciously preparing for the preliminary examinations.

Consideration of a candidate's fitness as a teacher might help to move departments away from the trauma associated with the preliminary examination. More personal examination of a candidate's development as a scholar and teacher is necessary along the way. "Decency suggests," Don Cameron Allen writes, "that no unqualified student should be allowed to face this inquisition." Similarly no Ph.D. candidate should arrive at an advanced point in his program to find that he is ill-suited, for a host of possible reasons, to becoming a college teacher.

A number of graduate departments place some emphasis upon acquainting degree candidates with the profession for which they are preparing. In the graduate psychology department at the University of Virginia, Frank Finger has conducted a seminar aimed at meeting this need.[9] The seminar takes in only students who have passed their prelims and deliberately maintains a "non-course" atmosphere. Wide reading in books and periodicals dealing with the broader professional aspects of college and university work provide the substance for the course. Such topics as university governance, kinds of higher educational institutions, academic freedom and tenure, history of higher education and of academic and professional psychology, fields of psychology, student rights and responsibilities, objectives of higher education, the professional marketplace, personnel problems, financial resources, professional ethics, are included. In the two semesters of the seminar, it has also been possible to include attention to the specifics of teaching and to conduct a teaching *practicum.* His conclusions, based upon the reaction of students in the seminar and reports about their activities in later years, are that such training has

[9]Frank W. Finger, " 'Professional Problems': Preparation for a Career in College Teaching," *American Psychologist,* November, 1969, 1044-1049.

helped students enter into teaching duties with zest and has provided them with a broader concept of a professor's responsibilities without hampering their growth as scholars.

In conclusion, what might be recommended, then, as a minimum program to develop a more accomplished college teacher? Since the particulars have been discussed previously, I will only list what I consider to be the important features:

1. Teaching experience for all Ph.D. candidates, limited in amount, and related to course work and informed supervision.

2. Specific study and discussion, preferably in a "non-course" atmosphere of teaching and learning and the broader aspects of higher education as a career.

3. Involvement of a substantial portion of the regular staff in the various activities associated with the development of the teacher.

4. Options within the dissertation requirement to permit the development of courses or curricular materials, and the investigation of or experimentation in teaching English.

5. Integration of teaching, course work, and other activities to strengthen the relation between subject matter preparation, professional development, and teaching.

6. Systematic feedback from graduate and undergraduate students and from alumni occupying varied teaching positions to strengthen existing preparation programs and to provide a regularly-constituted means of examination, modification and innovation.

These recommendations are not aimed at replacing the basic subject matter preparation essential to college teaching, though the whole question of the kind of subject matter preparation most appropriate to college teaching needs close attention. Their adoption might well mean a close examination of existing Ph.D programs and accommodation within them to arrive at programs which are workable as well as effective. I do not think such developments would stand in the way of moving to a four-year doctorate as recommended in the Allen report. Many of these suggestions are already embodied in the report. Many have been carried into effect. What is most needed now is departments willing to develop patterns and practices which might capture the imagination and energies of future teachers and bring their desires to a partial realization before they leave the graduate school.